DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 469 505 JC 020 685

AUTHOR	Burkhart, Joyce
TITLE	How Can the eCampus Be Organized and Run To Address Traditional Concerns, but Maintain an Innovative Approach to Providing Educational Access? Project Eagle Evaluation Question #3. Benchmarking St. Petersburg College: A Report to Leadership.
INSTITUTION	Saint Petersburg Coll., FL.
PUB DATE	2001-09-30
NOTE	13p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.spjc.edu/eagle/PEEQ3.htm.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; *College Faculty; Community Colleges; Computer Uses in Education; *Distance Education; Educational Technology; *Program Implementation; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Salaries; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Saint Petersburg College FL

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the findings of St. Petersburg College's (SPC) (Florida) evaluation question: "How can the eCampus be organized and run to address traditional faculty concerns, but maintain an innovative approach to providing educational access?" In order to evaluate this question, a list was compiled of faculty issues identified by institutions nation- and world-wide. Issues centered on instruction, compensation, intellectual property, and training. Steps were then taken to determine how SPC has addressed these four issues. Staff examined formal college policies related to faculty issues, interviewed all eCampus faculty, staff and administrators, and surveyed via email all SPC online faculty members. Results showed that in every category of faculty concern, SPC administration has dealt with most of the issues raised nationwide, and has, at times, established policies and procedures for which there has been no precedent. Findings indicated that, compared with other schools, SPC has been very proactive in dealing with matters related to its "e-structors." Finally, results and recommendations were broken down into specific performance successes and failures in the areas of instruction, compensation, intellectual property, and training. (CB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Burkhart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 469 505

ST. PETERSBURG COLLEGE

Project Eagle

Benchmarking St. Petersburg College: A Report to Leadership

Project Eagle Evaluation Question #3
www.spjc.edu/eagle/PEEQ3.htm

How Can the eCampus Be Organized and Run to Address Traditional Faculty Concerns, But Maintain an Innovative Approach to Providing Educational Access?

Submitted by
Joyce Burkhart
Coordinator, Research, Evaluation and Dissemination
Project Eagle
September 30, 2001

Introduction

To formulate an evaluation process of e-learning practices at St. Petersburg College (SPC) for Project Eagle, external evaluator Dr. Gordon "Spud" Van de Water, Education Commission of the States, suggested that the college first identify critical issues. Dr. James Olliver, Project Eagle director, with the help of the Project Eagle Work Group, formulated six questions, which were then worked into an evaluation plan by Dr. Van de Water and Joyce Burkhart, Coordinator of Research, Evaluation and Dissemination.

The decision was made to consider one question per quarter for the next 18 months, taking the following steps:

1. First, examine best e-learning practices related to that question, both nationwide and worldwide, using the Web as the primary source of information. The results of this external evaluation would be published in an issue Project Eagle's monthly newsletter, Best Educational E-Practices (BEEP).

2. Next, compile a list of all practices related to the question currently in use at SPC, using a variety of appropriate techniques and strategies.

3. Compare the best external practices with those offered at SPC.

4. Benchmark SPC and submit a report to the college leadership on the college's performance in the area under consideration.

5. Finally, disseminate the results nationally, using the Project Eagle Web site and other forms of information distribution.

This report represents Step 4, incorporating the results of Steps 1-3.

Background

The third question to be evaluated was related to faculty issues in an e-learning environment. In April 2001,

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

research was completed to compile a list of such issues as identified by institutions nationwide and worldwide. In May 2001, the results were published in Best Educational E-Practices (BEEP), Issue 8, *Faculty Issues in an E-Learning Environment.* The issues of concern included these:

A. Instructional Issues

B. Compensatory Issues

C. Intellectual Property Issues

D. Training Issues

From June to the middle of September, 2001, steps were taken to determine how SPC has addressed the faculty issues identified nationwide, as well as any that were found to be unique to the college. These steps included the following:

1. Examination of existing formal college policies related to faculty issues..
2. Interviews with selected eCampus faculty, staff and administrators.*
3. An informal survey via email of all SPC online faculty.*

In September 2001 external and internal services were compared, and the results compiled in this report. An executive summary appeared in Best Educational E-Practices (BEEP), Issue 13, October 1, 2001.

To get input from the faculty, who were not working in late July and early to mid-August, the originally scheduled completion date for Project Eagle Evaluation Question #3 was postponed from August 31 to September 30.

Results

A. Instructional Issues

1. Instructional technology support

Nationwide/worldwide. Earlier this year, faculty at Illinois State University were surveyed to determine what they wanted to make their e-learning efforts successful. Based on the results, the surveyors came up with six recommendations for support from instructional technology (IT) departments.

a. Create a selection of Web-based IT modules, each driven by and tied to a specific pedagogical strategy.

b. Invest IT efforts in discrete solutions mapped to instructional needs and strategies. They likened a product like WebCT to a Swiss-Army knife, useful to faculty more for its separate parts than as a whole.

c. Put less effort into solving individual faculty member's technical problems and more in the general creation of modules or templates that faculty could choose from as needed for their own courses.

d. Create venues for faculty to come together to share and trade their own experiences.

e. Guard against allowing technology to become dominant. The feeling was that it is sometimes better to wait to introduce a software upgrade or change until instructors can make the necessary adjustments to their instructional materials.

f. Provide support, not motivation, changing traditional incentive structures if necessary.

SPC. Because of the college's multi-campus and divergent structure, some of the efforts at Illinois State do not adapt themselves to the situation here. However, in terms of IT support, SPC provides the following:

a. Use of WebCT, which allows faculty range of discrete solutions, from using it as a syllabus only

through Web exercises and testing, to full online courses using all of the product's capabilities.

b. Limited creation of modules and templates for course development, (e.g., template course for the Medical Laboratory Technology program). Instead of using modules, instructional technologists work with faculty members individually to use their expertise to create the content. The primary role of the technologists, who are each assigned to work with individual campuses, is assistance with the design of a course. Options for SPC faculty range from using a cloned course, already created by another instructor, to creating completely unique courses.

c. Venues for faculty to come together in the form of an online discussion area for e-learning faculty that has provided a valuable opportunity for exchange.

d. Full support of faculty in the creation and maintenance of their courses. Instructional technologists, technology design specialists, a trained and staffed help desk, and various network and computer support specialists combine to provide IT support for faculty and students alike.

One of the two support services recommended at Illinois State and not available at SPC is the creation of based IT modules, although the newly developed E-Learning Journey (ELJ) training series for e-faculty is modularized and could be broken apart.

The other is the recommended waiting period when introducing software upgrades and changes. Largely because of the push by the Project Eagle grant to create more than 160 courses over a four-year period, plus the rapid growth in the SPC eCampus, instructional adjustments must sometimes be made fairly rapidly. However, when these changes take place, faculty have been offered the training and support they need to change over.

Faculty survey comments:

"IT support is wonderful at SPC..."
"The college has provided excellent support resources for e-faculty..."
"...we are lucky to have ITs at all campuses...I would like to see ITs rotating weekend call."
"ITs respond in a timely manner and are very helpful."
"The help desk is becoming more effective in helping students use technology."
"Overall, my hat's off to our ITs, technicians, and folks at the Help Desk."
"More instructors need to collaborate with IT to enhance their classes not only with technology, but also effective practices in designing these new hybrid learning environments."
"More help needed to make videos."

2. Instructional support for course development

Nationwide/worldwide. In 1997, the University of Nebraska polled more than 200 faculty teaching academic courses and thirty administrators to study the type of assistance and support they felt they needed to develop educational materials, almost 75% of whom had not previously taught via distance. The results showed the following areas instructors felt support was needed among those identified as the most important:

a. Interacting with students, getting student feedback.
b. Developing materials for students that support the course content and the use of the required technology.
c. Marketing the course.
d. Web-based delivery strategies.
e. Having a general knowledge of distance education.
f. Providing a local contact point for students.

SPC. Instructional support for eCampus faculty matches the criteria established by the University of Nebraska:

a. Opportunities for interaction with students, via the online student survey of instruction administered for every e-course, a bulletin board on the CyberAdvisor's Web site, and the inclusion of both email addresses and phone numbers to contact eCampus staff on all literature distributed to e-students.

b. Materials that support the course content and the use of the required technology in the form of a WebCT tutorial made available to students prior to the start of the semester. There is also extensive information posted to the eCampus Web site in order for students to prepare for their online experience.

c. An extensive marketing campaign is and has been underway, including both Web-based and traditional literature.

d. The eCampus has several Web-based delivery strategies, including the newly developed E-Learning Journey training series for faculty and the online instructors' discussion area.

e. General knowledge of distance education increases as more and more instructors and students become experienced in teaching and learning in an online format. SPC's mentor program for e-structors helps newer faculty who are working through their first semester online.

f. The recent creation of a full-time CyberAdvisor position provides a needed local contact point for students. In addition, the goal of eCampus staff is to provide "one-stop shopping" for all online students' needs.

3. Other instructional needs and concerns

Nationwide/worldwide. The State University of West Georgia conducted a study in 1999 of all its online faculty to determine attitudes on a number of items. One result was a list of suggestions on how the university could assist them in delivering online courses, which included the following:

a. Provide incentives for online instructors like laptops, student assistants, merit pay.
b. Limit the enrollments in online courses.
c. Fix WebCT problems in a timely manner and provide more learning time for WebCT.
d. Provide more detailed, understandable instructional materials to faculty.
e. Do not force faculty to teach online courses who do not wish to do so.
f. Provide mentors in each department or college for less experienced distance instructors.

SPC. In the area of general instructional needs and concerns, the college has addressed all the issues found pertinent by the State University of West Georgia:

a. In terms of incentives, most e-structors teach for supplemental pay, many have received laptops, and the college has launched a pilot for using online student assistants.

b. No e-course has an enrollment of more than thirty.

c. Because of the number of IT staff, as well as help desk and other support staff, WebCT problems can be addressed promptly.

d. Recognizing the need for more good instructional materials for online faculty, the eLearning Journey online faculty training series has been designed. In addition, the IT staff is available to deal with individual needs.

e. Since most e-structors teach their e-courses for supplemental pay, there is no pressure on full-time SPC faculty to teach non-traditional courses.

f. SPC already has a mentoring system in place, in which more experienced e-structors assist the less experienced. Instructional technologists also work with all online faculty as well.

Faculty survey comments:

"Faculty mentoring has been successful and needs to be expanded ..."

"I like the idea of a mentoring system."

"...word processing staffs need to upgrade their skills to provide a new kind of support for this new kind of teaching, and I think they should be compensated for doing so. We need help with the repetitive, tedious tasks - like putting questions on the test banks, adding glossary terms, etc."

"...support is good for Project Eagle courses. We may be moving forward too quickly with others, however. Other sources of funding need to be obtained, as evidenced by the number of courses that were submitted for PE [Project Eagle] vs the number that could be funded this year. What happens when the PE grant ends?"

B. Compensatory Issues

Nationwide/worldwide. Examinations of institutional concerns and policies indicated a core of issues related to compensation. In a survey conducted by Temple University in 1999, the following patterns emerged from the 45 institutions that participated.

1. Expenses paid for for developing an e-course:
   a. Internet service provider costs covered (39%).
   b. Software purchased (34%).

c. Computer equipment purchased (29%).
d. Costs or campus service units covered (27%).
e. Faculty overload pay (22%).
f. Faculty release time (21%).
g. Graduate or teaching assistants (7%).

2. Compensation for teaching an e-course
a. Internet service provider costs covered (33%).
b. Costs for campus service units covered (29%).
c. Software purchased (26%).
d. Faculty overload pay (26%).
e. Computer equipment purchased (22%).
f. Faculty release time (13%).
g. Graduate or teaching assistants (6%).

Fewer than 25% of the institutions surveyed set funds aside for e-structors specifically for travel, national conference fees, or discretionary use.

Research on the subject indicated that faculty most frequently request lower enrollment for e-courses, especially the first time a course is offered, and a reduced teaching load if online courses are included, because of the additional time required to deliver instruction successfully in this mode.

SPC. The college handles compensation issues in this way:

1. Expenses paid for for developing an e-course:
a. Internet service provider costs covered - Although Internet service provider costs are not covered, SPC has arranged a discounted rate with Time Warner's Road Runner service for home use of faculty, staff and students.
b. Software purchased - The college has an agreement with Microsoft for faculty to use any of its software that the college owns at home.
c. Computer equipment purchased - Each full-time faculty member is provided with an office computer.
d. Costs or campus service units covered - Service units are available at all campuses. In the creation of a new e-course, campus instructional technologists and technical design specialists provide varying levels of technical support to transform the faculty member's content ideas into Web-based material.
e. Faculty overload pay - SPC faculty receive supplemental pay for the development of e-courses.
f. Faculty release time - Release time for new e-course development is rarely done at SPC. Most often development is done for a salary supplement.
g. Graduate or teaching assistants - Faculty are not provided student assistants for the development of e-courses.

2. Compensation for teaching an e-course:
a. Internet service provider costs covered - Same as compensation for development of an e-course.
b. Costs for campus service units covered - Service is provided for the ongoing delivery of an e-course in the form of campus-specific computer and network support specialists, as well as a collegewide help desk.
c. Software purchased - Same as compensation for development of an e-course above.
d. Faculty overload pay - In the past, faculty have been compensated for teaching e-courses on a supplemental basis. This session there has been a shift to an increasingly large part of some faculty members' base workload devoted to e-courses, with on-campus courses as supplements.
e. Computer equipment purchased - A special initiative is underway to gradually provide laptop computers to e-structors, so that they can work at any location.
f. Faculty release time - Same as compensation for development of an e-course above.
g. Graduate or teaching assistants - The college is presently experimenting with the use of student assistants in a number of highly populated e-courses.

In terms of other compensatory issues, SPC, both through Project Eagle and staff and program development

funding, regularly sends faculty and staff to conferences to both learn and share their experiences through presentations about success in the e-learning arena. Two of the three Florida Association of Community College nominees for instructor of the year are from St. Petersburg College, and both their presentations deal with the effective integration of technology in teaching and learning.

The college has an enrollment cap of 30 on its e-courses, even if the standard course listing for a course is higher. In addition, SPC provides its faculty with support in the form of pre-training (a 32 hour online E-Learning Journey tutorial) and assistance during development and beyond by a team of instructional technologists, technology design specialists, and, where appropriate, faculty mentors in the same teaching discipline (most of whom have been the original designers of the courses).

Faculty survey comments:

"...compensation for designing classes under Project Eagle has been adequate...but...no provisions exist for continual improvement or innovation of existing classes that continues long after a course has been initially designed. No system of compensation seems to be in placefor classes designed outside the auspices of Project Eagle."

"When compensation for design and implementation of online classes is relegated to entirely supplemental pay, it is given a secondary status for full-time instructors that may not exceed 21 hours ECH. This limits the potential for many instructors to design and teach online classes at all. Adjunct instructors often design and implement these classes on their own time, adding insult to injury, considering their secondary treatment and rate of pay..."

"Design should be compensated and distinguished from instruction."

"Need to be able to teach multiple sections to accommodate all the students who want to take my Internet courses."

"Since Seminole [campus] gets the credit for these [online] courses, our home campuses are making it difficult for us [full-time faculty] to teach online courses as part of our base because it reduces the number of courses we teach at our home campus. Some campuses allow online courses only as extra pay and others limit the number to only one online courses as part of base. Faculty are caught in the middle of this situation."

"...a faculty member who teaches an online course as part of their base may use up to two duty hours for each ECH to reduce their total number of on-campus hours. Why should online courses get two duty hours per ECH when on-campus courses only get one? If we teach 15 ECH then we are required to put in 15 ECH office hours. The online courses should be treated the same way."

"I think every administrator should have to develop and teach at least one online course...some of them have NO idea what is involved [in developing] a WebCT course."

"I think that ECH should be looked at...I feel as though I am spending much more time on my online courses than I did face to face."

"If adjuncts are required to take an 8-week, 32-hour course before they can teach online, they should receive 1 ECH in compensation."

"Since most classes in the e-environment are supplemental pay classes for full-time and adjunct faculty, I don't believe there has been a realistic dialogue about how to compensate for the extra time it takes to teach, monitor, and update e-courses...I spend 75% of my office time on my two e-classes, which are supplemental pay."

"One issue I have at this time is the rate of pay for instructors and course developers for specialized topics. One size does not fit all for all topics. Specialized topics that require unique experience should be compensated at a rate that rewards them for their experience fairly. This issue, if corrected, will improve the quality of all our programs."

As they were in the faculty comments above, other concerns were recorded in the minutes of the Faculty Governance Organization (FGO) Senate of September 12, 2001. These included the lack of compensation for development and implementation of online classes and questions concerning the ECH limit and compensation for e-campus classes.

One additional concern raised at the FGO meeting was that college faculty and administration seem divided on the issue of teaching online classes as base pay. Some feel that all online classes should be taught on a supplemental basis, others that some or all can be taught as base pay. This issue was taken to SPC's Instructional Technology Advisory Group (ITAG) meeting on September 19, 2001, and a subcommittee was formed to further investigate the matter.

C. Intellectual Property Issues

Nationwide/worldwide. In February 2000, an international symposium on the ownership of online courses and course materials took place in Miami. Funded by the Pew Learning and Technology Program, it examined the issue of intellectual property in an e-learning environment, finding that although they may vary greatly from institution to institution, there are three basic approaches:

"1. *Some institutions assert ownership over the copyrightable works of their faculty, citing the agency principles of works made for hire.* They may qualify the assertion of ownership—for example, only when the work is software other specific media; only when projects are completed with the use of substantial institutional resources; only when the work can be patented or offers some prospect of royalties.

"2. *Some institutions allow faculty members to continue to assert ownership over their copyrightable works.* Again, institutions may qualify the ownership by asserting the college or university's right to perpetual, nonexclusive, royalty-free use of the materials in its internally administered programs; by establishing percentages of royalties distributed to the baseline of institutional costs that must be recovered before faculty members can share in the financial return; or by requiring a split-royalty policy, in which the author returns to the institution all royalties for products sold to students at the college or university.

"3. *Some institutions attempt to allocate ownership via contract.* It is critical to remember that the assertions of institutions or of faculty are immaterial to the actual authorship of the works. Authorship is dictated by the copyright statute—private parties are not able to change the allocation created by Congress, even if that allocation is unclear. Yet even though private parties cannot change the choices of Congress regarding authorship, they can allocate ownership of a work via contract. All or part of the copyright can be transferred between parties, and the terms of the transfer can be made subject to limitations of time, geography, or usage. This means that the scope of the transfer or license can be adapted to the needs of the parties—the license may be as broad or as narrow as they choose. Additionally, although private parties cannot usually alter a determination of authorship, they may secure their ownership expectations under uncertainty by providing for contingent allocations. For example, if a particular college or university wants to make certain that ownership is allocated to the faculty creator of a work, the parties can agree that even if a work is deemed a work made for hire, the institution will assign its rights in the work to the faculty member. This agreement, however, must be in place before work is completed."

Needless to say, the position of most faculty, as stated by the American Association of University Professors to *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 7/21/00, is that "faculty should be presumed to own the copyright of the work they create."

SPC. The college has addressed the issue of ownership of e-courses in its Addendum to the Supplemental/Adjunct Contract, also known as the "right to teach" contract. Designed for full-time faculty members who agree to develop new e-courses, it includes these intellectual property ownership components:

"**Ownership and Royalty**. The College shall be the sole owner of the coursework and any copyright applicable thereto. Should the coursework be offered for sale by the College outside the institution, and if still employed by the College or officially retired from the College, the Faculty Member shall be entitled to receive, as a royalty, fifty (50) percent of the proceeds from sales received by the College to be paid by the Board to the Faculty Member semi-annually provided the coursework has not been substantially changed. In the event Faculty Members collaborate on course development, the Faculty Members shall divide the fifty percent (50%) royalty.

"**Right to Teach**. The Faculty Member shall have the non-exclusive right to teach the course using the coursework developed by him/her for the next three (3) semesters the course is offered by the College provided there is sufficient enrollment and further provided, however, that if another Faculty Member develops similar coursework for the same course or two (2) faculty members collaborate to develop the same coursework, then the Faculty Members' right to teach shall rotate. The right to teach is dependent upon the satisfactory teaching performance of the Faculty Member and continued employment."

Additional SPC forms related to the creation of e-courses are an agreement to develop an online course in a checklist format, and an alternative ECH worksheet for development of online courses.

Faculty survey comments:

"The SPC position seems to be a fair compromise at a 50/50 split if online courses produced under Project Eagle are sold to other institutions. This should be extended to adjuncts, however, and courses designed outside of Project Eagle."

"They seem mostly fair."

"I took a look at the site for intellectual ownership and course maintenance, and I would be very surprised if the addendum was negotiated with online instructors. It seems rather iron-clad in that it obligates a person to maintain their courses without compensation...I have yet to see anyone suggest that ECHs are available to continued improvement projects..."

"The language of the addendum is rather harsh in statements that if after a certain time you are not doing a good job, the course will be taken away from you. Do we do this with regular in-class instructors? It's almost as if a double standard of instruction is developing...it should be the same whether in the online environment or in the traditional classroom."

"[Intellectual property is] another issue for me...mostly for our adjuncts. First you tell them that you are going to pay them next to nothing for their time and no benefits, and then you tell them that they don't own what they have developed and don't even have a right to teach the course! That form definitely needs to be modified."

D. Training Issues

Nationwide/worldwide. The undercurrent of a need for training was found in research related to the areas of instructional support and compensations that have been covered in the sectionds devoted to instructional issues and compensatory issues above. In 1999 Melanie Clay, Director of Distance Education at the State University of West Georgia, identified specific types of training, feeling that an ideal training program will include opportunities for at least four types of the following training:

1. group sessions.
2. one-on-one lab sessions.
3. web-based materials.
4. printed materials.
5. listservs.
6. mentorships.
7. monthly discussion sessions among peers.
8. observation of other distance courses.

According to Clay, training should be continuous and training for beginners should include at least the following:

1. an opportunity for addressing concerns.
2. distance learning technology and its impact on learners.
3. availability of administrative and support services.
4. fundamentals of and assistance with course development and adaptation.
5. techniques for encouraging interaction.
6. development of back-up and contingency plans.
7. how distance instruction ties in with the institutional mission.
8. copyright and other policy issues.

SPC. The IT department provides all of the specific types of training mentioned in the first list of eight listed by Clay:

1. Instructional technologists provide group sessions for faculty training at the campus level, bringing instructors together for formal or informal offerings on an as needed or on demand basis.

2. One-on-one lab sessions take place between technologists and faculty constantly, as instructors develop and maintain e-courses. These may take the form of training efforts or discovery sessions, the latter occurring when faculty have ideas for course content they wish to put in an online format and need technological assistance or training in doing so.

3. Web-based materials are presently available in three formats:
   a. The E-Learning Journey (ELJ) - A multipart training series for e-structors.

b. Viewlets - Small descriptive how-to's designed to answer questions about various aspects of producing Web-based course material.

c. Planet WebCT3 - A commercial product that provides faculty with instant assistance in using WebCT.

4. SPC has produced printed material to supplement Web-based materials. A handbook to accompany the ELJ is currently in preparation, and previous written manuals have been produced to assist in WebCT training efforts.

5. With the support of ITs, faculty have created a much-used discussion area for all online faculty that is linked to e-structors' personal WebCT pages.

6. SPC has a mentoring system in place, in which more experienced e-structors train and assist the less experienced the first time the latter teach an already developed e-course.

7. Scheduled meetings for e-structors would be generated at the campus level. There is presently an online instructors support group at HEC, In addition, the discussion area that exists for online faculty allows them to meet asynchronously whenever needed.

8. Instructional technologists receive continuing training on the development of e-courses. Presently all are enrolled in a distance education certification program given by Clay's own State University of West Georgia. As they learn of online materials developed at other institutions, technologists pass this information to faculty in disciplines that might find the information useful. One recent example of shared information is related to what others are doing for the hearing impaired and online education. Technologists have added a list of links to useful resources on the faculty WebCT page.

Clay's second list of training recommendations refers to the components necessary in any training for beginners. SPC provides formal training for all new e-structors in the form of the E-Learning Journey (ELJ), an online workshop that takes 26-32 hours over approximately eight weeks. It is organized into six main units:

1. A Successful E-Learning Community
2. Instructional Design Process
3. Teaching Principles and Learning Styles
4. Developing and Building an E-Learning Community
5. Using WebCT to Build An E-Learning Community
6. Other Course Building Applications to Enhance Instruction

Each unit is composed of a number of short lessons that should be completed sequentially. Most activities involve either participating in a discussion forum or creating an activity to upload to the assignment area. At the conclusion of the ELJ, the faculty member should be able to do the following:

1. Utilize WebCT as a student and facilitator.
2. Identify the similarities and differences of a traditional, distance (ITV) and online course.
3. Identify and implement strategies to develop and manage an E-Learning Community.
4. Demonstrate computer-mediated communication using WebCT communication tools.
5. Identify effective online community design principles for development and management of an online course.
6. Create an outline for an online course incorporating the instructional systems design process.
7. Create a WebCT course template for an online course using principles of effective layout and design following the Project Eagle Faculty Checklist as a guide.
8. Demonstrate an understanding of WebCT tools.
9. Create and upload a Web page with Front Page 2000.

Faculty survey comments:

"I much prefer the new E-Journey to the original WebCT training, which only concentrated on the mechanics of the program. I like the way instructors get to experience being a student in a WebCT class."

"Training needs to be made continually available online and in workshops for instructors in various stages of adopting technology."

"To review all of the tutorials that have come out about the all of the new innovations is excessively time consuming."

"The training is sufficient, but the ongoing support is most helpful."

"I think the professional development time and program needed to bring new instructors into the online environment is overstated. I am convinced that working a good mentor and the local campus tech support that

many instructors could turn out excellent online courses without having to endure the lengthy tutorials and training sessions required before someone can now teach online using WebCT."

Review and Recommendations

In every category of faculty concern, SPC administration, particularly that of its eCampus, has attempted to address traditional faculty concerns in a manner that at the same time supports the changes and innovations in online educational access. The college has dealt with most of the issues raised by institutions nationwide, sometimes breaking new ground in establishing policies and procedures for which there has been no precedent.

Compared to many other schools, SPC has been very proactive in dealing with matters related to its e-structors. The collection of forms and procedures that link to the Project Eagle Web site reflects the extent to which the college has streamlined and formalized eCampus processes. A summary of SPC's activities, with faculty recommendations for improvement, follows.

A. Instructional Issues

1. Instructional technology support. At the present time, largely because of the availability of Project Eagle funds, IT support is strong. Instructional technologists for every campus, technology design specialists, a trained and staffed help desk, and various network and computer support specialists assist in every aspect of e-course development and maintenance. They provide support for faculty and students alike.

Faculty surveyed were aware and appreciative of the efforts being made to make their transition to the world of e-learning an easy one. Their comments included adjectives like "wonderful," "excellent," timely," and "effective." Besides the obvious question, which has surfaced in discussions at all levels, of how these service will continue after Project Eagle funding ends, there were no negative comments in this area.

IT staff themselves have admitted that because of the push by Project Eagle to create more than 160 online courses in four years, instructional adjustments like software upgrades and changes must sometimes be made more rapidly than experts recommend for faculty comfort. The department has, however, given extra attention to providing needed training and support to all e-structors when these changes are made.

2. Instructional support for course development. SPC does an outstanding job in providing support for course development. Issues that fell under this heading included institutional support in getting student feedback, developing materials that support both course content and the use of technology, marketing, inventing new Web-based delivery strategies, acquiring a general knowledge for distance education, and providing a local contact point for students.

SPC's eCampus has produced an online student survey of instruction for all e-courses. There is an online discussion area for e-structor interaction, as well as extensive information on the eCampus Web site to prepare students for their online experience, The college recently expanded the position of CyberAdvisor to a full-time one, providing the local contact point for e-students that both national research and SPC staff and students felt was essential to online student success. eCampus has undertaken an impressive marketing campaign, which has resulted in an increase in online enrollment from 1152 in Fall 2000 to 2911 in Fall 2001.

It is significant that this area of concern was the only one that drew no comments - positive or negative - whatsoever on the faculty survey. It is safe to assume that faculty are satisfied with the college's efforts in providing instructional support for course development.

3. Other instructional needs and concerns. These needs and concerns were identified nationally as issues like incentives for faculty participation in online teaching, enrollment caps, response time in correcting WebCT problems, provision of instructional materials to faculty, and mentors for less experienced distance instructors. SPC has addressed all these issues and faculty were quick to note that fact. They were complimentary of the mentoring system the college has begun and feel general support is good.

One suggestion for improvement that was made concerned the use of traditional campus word processing staffs, who with appropriate training and compensation, could help e-structors with "the repetitive, tedious tasks - like

putting questions on the test banks, adding glossary terms, etc." Once again, the question of additional funding for course development was raised, both after Project Eagle ends and even now for the development of non-Eagle funded online courses.

B. Compensatory Issues

The college has clearly spelled out policies for compensation of e-structors, both in developing and teaching e-courses. Highlights of those policies include supplemental pay for developing a course, and a recent shift from having e-courses taught entirely as supplemental to mixing the base workload between e-courses and on-campus courses.

Non-salary forms of compensation include providing each full-time faculty member with an office computer, a contract with a local company to provide discounted home Internet service to staff and students, a current, ongoing initiative to provide laptop computers to e-structors, and a contract with Microsoft that allows faculty to use any of its software that the college owns at home. In addition, SPC puts an enrollment cap of 30 in its e-courses, even if the college's standard course listing is higher.

In spite of these efforts, compensation was the area of most discontent among faculty. One took exception to the absence of compensation for any classes developed without Project Eagle funding. Several noted that compensation for teaching online courses does not reflect the fact that it is much more time-consuming to maintain an e-course, while another made the opposing comment that reducing on-campus office hours for e-structors was unfair to those teaching traditional courses.

Other issues that were raised included a need for extra compensation for the development of specialized courses, lack of compensation for continual improvement of existing classes and a lack of compensatory equity for adjunct e-faculty.

Last, some faculty expressed a sense of being caught in conflicts between/among campus administrators with divergent opinions on the value and place of online courses in a full-time faculty member's workload. This concern is reminiscent of an issue raised in Project Eagle Evaluation Question #2, in which college administrators noted perceived lack of cooperation among some departments and directors in the scheduling of faculty for e-courses.

Because this last issue of administrative division regarding compensation for teaching online classes as base or supplemental is also currently under consideration by the Faculty Governance Organization, it emerges in this report as the one most in need of immediate resolution.

C. Intellectual Property Issues

Of the several ways recommended at a recent international symposium on the ownership of online courses and course materials, SPC has chosen the alternative of sole ownership of the coursework by the college. If the coursework is offered for sale outside the institution, the faculty member receives a 50% royalty from the sale. In addition, SPC has initiated a unique "right to teach" policy: e-structors have the non-exclusive rights to teach a course using the coursework they have developed for the next three semesters the courses is offered. If other faculty members are involved in the development of coursework for the same course, then the right to teach rotates.

Faculty felt this policy was fair as far as it goes. However, some concern was raised that the policy was too harsh and not equitable. The statement that a course might be taken away from an instructor not doing a good job might create a double standard, since on-campus courses are not governed by any similar written rules, and adjuncts seem more vulnerable in this environment.

D. Training Issues

The issue of training is one that has been thoroughly addressed at SPC. An external survey recommended that an ideal training program include at least four types of training from its list of eight; the college provides them all. Group sessions, one-on-one labs, Web-based and printed materials, listservs, mentorships, discussion sessions and observation of other distance courses are all available for e-faculty.

In addition, training for beginning e-faculty, which is identified as a critical issue, has taken a giant step forward with the recent creation of the E-Learning Journey (ELJ), an eight-week online workshop organized into six units that each contain a number of short lesson.

Faculty who responded to the survey were generally pleased with the training, especially the ELJ, and also commented on the value of ongoing support. However, a few felt that the training required before teaching online was excessive and another suggested workshops and continual online training for instructors in various stages of adopting technology.

Overall, the college is doing an exemplary job as it rapidly moves forward in the creation of an eCampus which is one of the largest among colleges and universities in the state. The unresolved issues that emerged in this report were surprisingly few compared to those that exist nationwide. Issues that have been raised in the past have been resolved as quickly as possibly, more often than not, policies devised at the planning stages of e-course development, thus eliminating potential issues before they begin.

Not unexpectedly, the area of compensation is one that seems most to require some immediate attention, and steps have already begun to bring these matters to the attention of administrators and other college groups who can deal with them.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").